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## A-F Acc ountability: Legisla tive Context



## House Bill 22, 85n ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Texas Legislature

"The commissioner shall evaluate school district and campus performance and assign each district and campus an overall performance rating of"
A
B C
D or F

## A-FAccountability: G a thening Stakeholder Input

## House Bill 22, 85h Texas Legislature

"The commissioner shall solicit input statewide from persons ... , including school district boards of trustees, administrators and teachers employed by school districts, parents of students enrolled in school districts, and other interested stakeholders."


## Feedback Opportunities

- Will solicit input on the a spects over which commissioner has a uthority
- Won't solicit input on a spects that are required by statute


## Three Domains: Combining to Calculate Overall Sc ore



A =Exemplary Performance
$B=$ Recognized Performance
C =Acceptable Performance
$D=$ In Need of Improvement
F = Unacceptable Performance


## Student Achievement Performance



## Student Ac hievement C alc ulating Sc ore

## $60 \times 30 \mathrm{TK}$

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
By 2030, at least 60 percent of Texans ages 25-34 will have a certificate ordegree.

StudentAchievement
Score


## StudentAchievement C alc ulating Sc ore



Elementary School


Middle School


High School/District

- College, Career, Military Ready (CCMR)
- Graduation Rates


## StudentAchievement CCMR Indic ators

## College Ready

- Meet criteria on AP/IB exams
- Meet TSI criteria (SAT/ACT/TSIA) in reading and mathematics
- Complete a college prep course offered by a partnership between a district and higher education institution as required from HB5
- Complete a course fordual credit
- Complete an OnRampscourse
- Eam an associate'sdegree
- Meet standardson a composite of indicators indic ating college readiness


## Career Ready

- Eam industry certification
- Be admitted to post-secondary industry certification program


## Military Ready

Enlist in the United StatesArmed Forces

## StudentAchievement CCMR Indic ators

## Career Ready

- Eam industry certific ation
- August 21 To the AdministratorAddressed letter
- 74 Industry-based certific ations
- Collected via PEIMS in Fall 2017 collection (for 2016-17 graduates)
- Certific ation list will be reviewed annually
- Be admitted to post-secondary industry certific ation program
- Collection and use TBD


## Distinction Designations: CTE-CoherentSequence

## Postsecondary Readiness Distinction Designation

Coherent Sequence of CTE C ourses will rema in an indic ator in Distinction Designations

- PEIMS 101 (summer 2017 submission)
- Percentage of 2016-17 annual graduates enrolled in a four-yearplan of study to take two or more CTE courses for three or more credits


## Sc hool Progress: Growth



## School Progress: Two Aspects to Progress



Feedlback Opportunities

- Better of the two
- Average of the two
- Greater weight for one of them


## Student Growth: Mea suring Adva ncement



## Student Growth: Percent of Students G a ining

CunentYear

|  | Does Not Meet <br> Grade Level | Approaches Grade Level | Meets Grade Level | Masters Grade Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Does Not Meet Grade Level | Met/Exceeded <br> Growth Measure $=\mathbf{1}$ pt <br> Did not meet $=\mathbf{0}$ pts | Met/Exceeded <br> Growth Measure $=\mathbf{1}$ pt <br> Did not meet $=.5 \mathrm{pts}$ | 1 pt | 1 pt |
| Approaches Grade Level | Met/Exceeded <br> Growth Measure $=\mathbf{1}$ pt <br> Did not meet $=\mathbf{0} \mathbf{p t s}$ | Met/Exceeded <br> Growth Measure $=1$ pt <br> Did not meet $=.5 \mathrm{pts}$ | 1 pt | 1 pt |
| Meets Grade Level | 0 pts | 0 pts | 1 pt | 1 pt |
| Masters Grade Level | 0 pts | 0 pts | 0 pts | 1 pt |

## Student Growth: Percent of Students G a ining

Curent Year


## Student Growth: Percent of Students G a ining

## Curent Year

|  | Does Not Meet <br> Grade Level | Approaches <br> Grade Level | Meets Grade Level | Masters Grade Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Does Not Meet <br> Grade Level | Met/Exceeded <br> Growth Measure $=1 \mathrm{pt}$ <br> Did not meet $=0 \mathrm{pt}$ | Met/Exceeded <br> Growth Measure $=1$ pt <br> Did not meet $=.5 \mathrm{pts}$ | 1 pt | 1 pt |
| Approaches Grade Level | Met/Exceeded <br> Growth Measure $=1 \mathrm{pt}$ <br> Did not meet $=0 \mathrm{pts}$ | Met/Exceeded <br> Growth Measure $=\mathbf{1}$ pt <br> Did not meet $=.5 \mathrm{pts}$ | 1 pt | 1 pt |
| Meets Grade Level | 0 pts | 0 pts | 1 pt | 1 pt |
| Masters Grade Level | 0 pts | 0 pts | 0 pts | 1 pt |

## Student Growth: Percent of Students G a ining

Curent Year


## Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress

Higher Levels of Student
Achievement


## Relative Performance: Measuring School Progress



## Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educ ational Equity



## Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educ ational Equity

All Students


Race/Ethnicity


Special Education


English Leamers


Continuousty Enrolled and Mobile Students

## Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educ ational Equity

## Student Groups

- All Students
- African American
- Hispanic
- White
- American Indian
- Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Two orMore Races
- Ec onomically Disa dvantaged
- Current and Former Special Education
- Current and Monitored English Leamers
- Continuously Enrolled/Non-C ontinuously Enrolled


## Indicators

- Academic Achievement in Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science and Social Studies
- Growth in Reading and Mathematics (Elementary and Middle Schools)
- Graduation Rates
- English Lea mer La nguage Proficiency Status
- College, Career, and Military Readiness Performance
- At or Above Meets Grade Level Performance in Reading and Mathematics


## Closing the Gaps: Ensuring Educ ational Equity

Subgroup Achievement Target

\% of Subgroups thatmeettarget

## Local Accountability Plan:

Local Ac c ountability



## Local Accountability Plan: Purpose and Requirements

## Purpose

To allow districts (at theiroption) to rate campuses using locally developed domains and a c countability measures

## Requirements for Districts

- Local plans must include the TEAassigned three domain performance ratings (at least $50 \%$ of the overall rating).
- Locally developed domain and measures must provide for the a ssignment of $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ grades and be reliable and valid.


## More Requirements for Districts

- Auditable calculations
- Campusscore card that can be displayed on TEA's website
- Publicly a vailable explanation of the methodology used to assign ratings
- Plans submitted to TEA for approval


## Feedback Opportunity

Volunteer to participate in the pilot program.

## Local Accountabilility Plan: Getting the Plan Approved

## Authority

The commissioner has authority to develop the process to approve requests to assign campus performance ratings.

## Requirements for Approval

- The agency determines whether the plan meets the minimum requirements.
- An audit conducted by the agency verifies calculations included in the plan.
- A review panelapprovesthe plan.


## One Condition

A locally developed ac countability system can only be used forcampuses not assigned an overall rating of D orF by TEA.

## New Indicator: Extrac uric ular/Cocuric ular

## Feasibility Study

- Determine the feasibility of incorporating indic a tors that account for extra curic ular and cocuric ularstudent activity.
- The commissionermay establish an advisory committee.


## Report

A report to the legislature on the feasibility of these indicators is due by December 1, 2022, unless a simila rindic ator is a dopted priorto December 1, 2022.

## Feedback Opportunities

- Make suggestions for extracuricular or coc umic ular indicator
- Volunteer to serve on a committee


## A-F Timeline: Implementation of HB 22



## Questions and Feedback

## Feedback

feedbackAF@tea.texas.gov


## Resources

- http://tea.texas.gov/A-F
- http://tea.texas.gov/accountability
- performance.reporting@tea.texas.gov
- (512) 463-9704

